

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	ON NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,343	. 0	9/13/2004	Chuan-Pei Yu	JEMP0001USA	5342
27765	7590	11/14/2006		EXAMINER	
		INTELLECTUAL	TON, MINH TOAN T		
P.O. BOX 506 MERRIFIELD, VA 22116				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	 , · • - -			2871	

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/711,343	YU, CHUAN-PEI				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Toan Ton	2871				
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	opears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the maili earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNION .136(a). In no event, however, may a did will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONITE, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	•					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28	September 2006.					
,						
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.E). 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims		•				
 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-12,14 and 16-23 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdress 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-2, 4-12, 14, 16-23 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 	awn from consideration.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.					
Application Papers		•				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac	cepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to th						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	· ·					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreignal All b) Some * c) None of:	•	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority docume2. Certified copies of the priority docume		Annlication No.				
2. Certified copies of the priority docume3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri						
application from the International Bure						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis		received.				
·	•					
		·				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Professories Potent Proving Poving (PTO 948)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date				
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/711,343

Art Unit: 2871

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 4, 12 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Oda et al (US 2003/0063234).

Oda discloses a liquid crystal display device comprising (see at least Figures 1, 6): a liquid crystal display panel; a light source (e.g., 12) for providing light beams to irradiate the liquid crystal display panel; and an optical sheet (e.g., 15,) positioned between the liquid crystal display panel and the light source and having a first surface facing the light source, the first surface having a plurality of prisms for totally reflecting portions of ambient light beams that have passed through the liquid crystal display panel to irradiate the liquid crystal display panel; each of the prisms comprising a first plane and a second plane, the included angle between the first plane and the second plane being in the range 80-110° (see at least col. 4, [0049], last two lines, which is within Applicant's range of 80°-130°).

Oda discloses the liquid crystal display device comprising each of the prisms being a symmetric structure or an asymmetric structure (see at least Figures 1, 6).

Oda discloses the liquid crystal display device comprising each of the prisms comprises a first plane and a second plane for totally reflecting portions of the ambient light beams that have passed through the liquid crystal display panel (see at least Figures 1, 6 & col. 4, [0048]).

Oda discloses the liquid crystal display device comprising the optical sheet (e.g., 15)

Application/Control Number: 10/711,343

Art Unit: 2871

having a second surface facing the liquid crystal display panel (see at least Figures 1, 6).

Both the claimed invention and Oda disclose the same structural LCD device comprising the optical sheet with similar prismatic structure, and thus comprising inherent functions/results such as increased brightness.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9-11, 14 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oda as applied to claims 1-2, 4, 12 and 23 above.

Oda discloses the use of a diffusing sheet (e.g., 16) for achieving advantages such as increased luminance, increased viewing angle. Further, it would have been at least obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ an optical sheet formed integrally as a diffusing sheet for achieving advantages such as advantages such as cost reduction (e.g., minimizing component(s), known as a common goal in the art) while achieving increased luminance and/or brightness.

Alternative structure(s) appear at least to be obvious variations (i.e., not patentably distinct and functionally equivalent) to each other to one of ordinary skill in the art. For example: the second or first surface comprising prisms, the prisms comprising symmetric or asymmetric structure, the optical sheet comprising a diffusing sheet or polarizer.

Application/Control Number: 10/711,343

Art Unit: 2871

Materials used for the diffuser/polarizer such as polycarbonate are common and known in the art for achieving advantages such as excellent transparency. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a diffuser/polarizer such as polycarbonate, common and known in the art, for achieving advantages such as excellent transparency.

3. Claims 5-8 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oda as applied to claims above 1-2, 4, 9-12, 14 and 20-23 and further in view of Shibata (US 5724108).

Shibata discloses a liquid crystal display device comprising an optical (prismatic) sheet employing the Snell law of refraction, wherein the display device yields advantages such as widening viewing angle characteristic. Therefore, it would have been at least obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ an optical sheet employing the Snell law of refraction for achieving advantages such as widening viewing angle characteristic.

Further, it would have been at least obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ an optical sheet having desired particular characteristics such as particular ranges as achieving advantages such as sufficient reflectance, good brightness, wide viewing angles since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable or optimum ranges involves only routine skill in the art (In re Aller, In re Boesch).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the amended claims have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Contact Information

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Toan Ton whose telephone number is (571) 272-2303.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

November 8, 2006